



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,229	04/27/2006	John William Chapman	056159-5261	6003
9629	7590	03/17/2011	EXAMINER	
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			STEADMAN, DAVID J	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1656				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/17/2011		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/539,229	CHAPMAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> David J. Steadman	<b>Art Unit</b> 1656

**All Participants:**

(1) David J. Steadman.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Zachary Derbyshire.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 2 March 2011

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*NONE*

Claims discussed:

*NONE*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Tanner et al., US Patent 5,714,377; Ng et al. US Patent Application Publication 2002/0068325*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David J. Steadman/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: As a follow-up to the personal interview conducted on 3/1/11, the examiner contacted applicant's representative regarding a prior art document, Tanner et al., that was identified during a prior art search, which reference may be relevant if Ng et al. reference is antedated. The examiner noted that identifying the reference of Tanner et al. is intended for compact prosecution and that this is not an indication that Tanner et al. is the only other reference relevant to inactivating PMT protein for heterologous protein production in yeast, noting that there may be references other than Tanner et al. that are more relevant to this technology. The examiner also requested a copy of the Interview Summary for the 3/1/11 interview, noting that the electronic copy was lost due to a computer freeze. Mr. Derbyshire graciously provided the requested copy.